

**REMARKS**

In the Final Office Action<sup>1</sup>, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7-11 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,768,382 to Schneier et al. ("*Schneier*"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,671,412 to Christiano ("*Christiano*"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,629,980 to Stefik et al. ("*Stefik*"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,103,574 to Peinado et al. ("*Peinado*"); rejected claims 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Schneier*, *Christiano*, *Stefik*, *Peinado*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,590,288 to Castor et al. ("*Castor*"); and rejected claim 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Christiano*, *Stefik*, and *Peinado*.

Applicants propose to amend claims 1, 17, and 57. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, 15-22, and 57 remain pending.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, 15-22, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 1 recites a data processing apparatus including, for example:

...  
a hash-value generating circuit that generates hash values of the content data, the content key data, and the usage control policy data by compressing the data into data having a predetermined bit length;  
a public key encryption circuit that creates signature data using the hash values and verifies the integrity of the signature data  
...

(emphasis added).

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

The Examiner correctly states that *Schneier, Christiano, and Stefik* do not disclose “generating a hash value of the key data and the usage control policy data” (Final Office Action at page 9). Therefore, *Schneier, Christiano, and Stefik* fail to teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements including, for example, “a hash-value generating circuit that generates hash values of the content data, the content key data, and the usage control policy data by compressing the data into data having a predetermined bit length” and “a public key encryption circuit that creates signature data using the hash values and verifies the integrity of the signature data,” as recited in claim 1.

*Peinado* does not cure the deficiencies of *Schneier, Christiano, and Stefik*.

*Peinado* discloses a method for digital rights management. According to *Peinado*, a DRM system may direct a “user to a license server to obtain a license” or may transparently obtain a “license from such license server without any action necessarily on the part of the user” (col. 2, lines 53-58). The license may include a decryption key that “decrypts the encrypted data,” “a description of the rights . . . conferred by the license and related conditions,” and “a digital signature that ensures the integrity of the license” (col. 2, lines 59-65).

The Examiner cites col. 20, line 38 - col. 21, line 12 of *Peinado* to disclose the claimed “hash-value generating circuit that generates hash values of the content data, the content key data, and the usage control policy data” and “public key encryption circuit that creates signature data using the hash values and verifies the integrity of the signature data” (Final Office Action at page 9).

This passage of *Peinado* discloses the elements that license 16 may include.

License 16 may include a content ID, Digital Rights License, decryption key, digital signature, and certificate. Even assuming that *Peinado* discloses generating hash values of “the content key data” and “the usage control policy data,” which Applicants do not concede, *Peinado* does not teach or suggest generating “hash values of the content data, the content key data, and the usage control policy data by compressing the data into data having a predetermined bit length,” as recited in claim 1.

*Peinado* does not generate hash values of “the content key data” and “the usage control policy data” by “compressing the data into data having a predetermined bit length.” In addition, claim 1 also recites “a public key encryption circuit” that 1) “creates signature data using the hash values” and 2) “verifies the integrity of the signature data.” While *Peinado* mentions a signature, any signature data that may exist is not created using “hash values of the content data, the content key data, and the usage control policy data by compressing the data into data having a predetermined bit length.”

Therefore, *Peinado* does not teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements including, for example, “hash values of the content data, the content key data, and the usage control policy data by compressing the data into data having a predetermined bit length” and “a public key encryption circuit that creates signature data using the hash values and verifies the integrity of the signature data,” as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, *Schneier*, *Christiano*, *Stefik*, and *Peinado* fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore allowable for at

least the reasons presented above. Claims 2, 3, 5, 7-11, 15, and 16 depend from claim 1 and are thus also allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Independent claims 17 and 57, though of different scope from claim 1, are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Although the Examiner cites *Castor* in the rejection of dependent claims 18-22, Applicants respectfully assert that *Castor* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Schneier*, *Christiano*, *Stefik*, and *Peinado* discussed above. Therefore, claims 18-22 are also allowable at least due to their dependence from claim 17.

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, 15-22, and 57 in condition for allowance. This Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully point out that the final action by the Examiner presented some new arguments against Applicants' invention. It is respectfully submitted that the entering of the Amendment would allow the Applicants to reply to the final rejections and place the application in condition for allowance.

Finally, Applicants submit that the entry of the amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and withdrawal of the rejections. Pending claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, 15-22, and 57 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants request a favorable action.

Customer No. 22,852  
Attorney Docket No.: 09812.0497-00  
Application No.: 09/741,668

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 12, 2009

By: /David W. Hill/  
David W. Hill  
Reg. No. 28,220